

Proposal Reviews

#248: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Water Education Foundation

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding	#1
	#2
	#3

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	X
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$360,000.**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

Do not fund \$36,640 of proposal for Science and Water Policy report.

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel recommends funding the update of the video "To Quench A Thirst," the update of the Delta Water Map, the Delta tours for journalists, and the Teaching Tools components. The Selection Panel recommends not funding the Science and Water Policy briefing paper component of the proposal absent the identification of technically qualified authors and technically qualified editorial review body.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Environmental Education Technical Review Form

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	All 5 activities are valuable and help in a cumulative way as well. Two recommendations from the review team: 1) highlight how Project WET incorporates the ERP, and 2) consider developing different video user guides depending on the audience (farm group, environmental group, civic organization) so that video can be shown in local meetings as well as being broadcast via PBS
X Above average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Clearly stated educational goals, objectives and expected outcomes.** Are the project's educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem? Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration?

The 5 projects and the goals are clearly stated. Target Audience is wide and diverse. This effort will broaden understanding of the Bay-Delta estuary and the CALFED Bay-Delta Program that is the first step to changing behaviors.

2. **Justification (including conceptual model, likelihood of success).** Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? Is it supported by research or past results?

The WEF has a long history with its tours, Delta map, teaching tools, and producing balanced, unbiased written source materials on various related topics. Their success is based on this history.

3. **Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).** Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants?

This project has a very appropriate integration of activities and materials that are very appropriate for the various audiences these tools will reach. It can be readily implemented.

4. **Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value).** Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities?

This project has a strong educational link. Some of the materials are for the Project WET targeted to the different k-14 grade levels and meet mandatory teaching standards.

5. **Replicability and dissemination of the program or project.** Can the project be replicated, if successful? Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others?

There are plans for broad dissemination of several of the tools developed.

6. **Pre- and post-project evaluation component.** Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

The evaluation methods seem effective and appropriate.

7. **Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).** Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended?

This project has qualified staff.

8. **Cost/benefit.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Budget is reasonable and adequate.

9. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Bay medium; because of statewide implementation Delta high San Joaquin low; doesn't relate to the SJ Valley; should consider SJV activities Sacramento high; should include No. Cal. In the video update; all educational components are applicable to the region

10. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

Prior Performance good Compliance good Budget good

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

proposed project is state-wide education program, regional panel determined project as medium priority for Bay region

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

yes and no

- video and map may be more useful when CALFED has governance and funding institutionalized - WEF has past success with partnering with local groups for tours - other products have statewide focus; has widespread support from many groups

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

- proposal definitely more oriented statewide, Delta and watershed, rather than Bay region - conforms to env. ed. component of multi-regional Restoration Priorities (MR-3: Implement environmental education actions) - excellent track record for env. ed. publications for a wide audience; high quality publications

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

- projects based on Bay-Delta CALFED and other related activities: restoration, water quality, water assurance, etc. - will provide a link between these activities and a wide range of stakeholders

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

☒ Yes -No

How?

- research for various project components will involve input from many local organizations and CALFED, but not particularly oriented to the Bay region - work will highlight current and future restoration projects in the Delta

Other Comments:

none

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 248

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel felt it was important for WEF to continue its public outreach efforts and updates to various maps and other outreach media, based on new information about the CALFED program over the last few years.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

This project is based on/builds upon past WEF projects: PBS documentary; Delta water map; Bay-Delta journalists tour; and Teaching Tools (K-12 curriculum). It would also issue a briefing paper on science and water policy. No CEQA/NEPA requirements at issue.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

MR-3:Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Project proponents highlight and are supportive of ongoing and future CALFED ecosystem restoration projects.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Advisory Committees are made up of diverse stakeholders for the documentary video, Delta water map, and briefing paper.

Other Comments:

**Seems like a balanced outreach program for the public, journalists, teachers, and policymakers.
Excellent support and cost shares proposed.**

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Overall Ranking: **X**Low -Medium -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

Good programs for Bay-Delta and northern areas. Doesn't relate to the San Joaquin Valley.

This proposal does not appear to involve any significant new developments.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

The major aspects of the proposal involves revision of existing programs (television documentary and Delta water map). The others (Journalists tour, teaching curriculum tools and a policy paper) are new activities. The tour has been conducted previously, so it seems that most of these activities are feasible.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

The proposal conforms to the Multi-regional priority No. 3- Implement environmental education actions throughout the geographic scope. It should be noted though that although the documentary pertains to California as a whole, the programs all focus on the Bay-Delta region.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

The educational projects are largely about CALFED issues themselves and therefore are intimately tied to CALFED and more to the CVPIA. Other than in general terms, the proposal is not directly related to other restoration projects.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

The development of the documentary and the school teaching curriculum are coordinated with state-wide public and educators, respectively. The use of the Delta water map is unclear. An advisory committee is used to develop it.

Small advisory committees are used for part of the project development, which itself does not involve any large number of people.

Other Comments:

Updating an award nominated video is an auspicious goal. Doing it to deal with Klamath, Oregon issues is irrelevant to the SJV. Many extraordinary efforts are ongoing in the SJV and have been ignored. Consequently, this project is of little value to the SJV.

WEF should consider SJV outreach activities.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The applicant has a proven track record and 43% matching funds. The proposal was very well written. The panel recommends including Northern Sacramento Valley in updating television documentary.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

All 5 multi-faced education components are applicable to our region.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Although not directly restoration activities, each component of the proposed project will relate by educational outreach to the Sacramento region priorities.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Each portion of the proposed project is supportive of the ongoing and future ecosystem restoration projects.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

The proposed projects involve advisory committees and diverse stakeholders statewide.

Other Comments:

This proposal helps provide non-biased reporting of many CALFED related activities.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 248

New Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

CALFED #98-B36, USBR #99-FC-20-0022 - Water Education Foundation - Development and Implementation of an Environmental Education Program for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program

CALFED #99-B26, USBR #00-FC-20-0017 - Water Education Foundation - Bay-Delta Education Project

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

None

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 248

New Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**WUE Proposal #WUE01-0077.pdf Title: Water Conservation and Recycling Awareness
CALFED WUE Project through DWR**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

None

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Too early to tell

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Too early to tell

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Too early to tell

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain:

Too early to tell

Other Comments:

Previous history with Water Education Foundation shows that they need very close supervision. For example, the note in their proposal that they updated the Delta Map in 2001 "with the close partnership with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program." I have a very vivid memory of Ms. Schmidt-Sudman attending a review session with CALFED staff where she made it clear that although CALFED provided partial funding for the map, she considered our input to be advisory - SHE would ultimately decide what goes on the map.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 248

New Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

01-N41

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 248

Applicant Organization: Water Education Foundation

Proposal Title: Tiered Public Outreach Program

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Education only. No permits or environmental documentation necessary.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

N/A

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:**Proposal Number:** 248**Applicant Organization:** Water Education Foundation**Proposal Title:** Tiered Public Outreach Program

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

Funding program did not carry forward correctly - \$3.00 difference

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: